Reconstruction of chaotic neural network from observed firing rates

A. Pikovsky
Institute for Physics and Astronomy, University of Potsdam, Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24/25, 14476 Potsdam-Golm, Germany and Department of Control Theory, Nizhni Novgorod State University, Gagarin Av. 23, 606950, Nizhni Novgorod, Russia

(Dated: April 5, 2016)

Randomly coupled neural fields demonstrate chaotic variation of firing rates, if the coupling is strong enough, as has been shown by Sompolinsky et. al [Phys. Rev. Lett., v. 61, 259 (1988)]. We present a method for reconstruction of the coupling matrix from the observations of the chaotic firing rates. The approach is based on the particular property of the nonlinearity in the coupling, as the latter is determined by a sigmoidal gain function. We demonstrate that for a large enough data set, the method gives an accurate estimation of the coupling matrix and of other parameters of the system, including the gain function.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Tp,87.19.lj

arXiv:1604.00619v1 [nlin.CD] 3 Apr 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding connectivity of networks of coupled dynamical units is a general problem appearing not only in physics, but also in ecology, epidemiology, genetic regulation, and climate dynamics (see, e.g., Refs. [1]). A particularly important application field is neuroscience, where revealing brain connectivity is a topic of hot current interest [2]. A general goal here is to reconstruct the interactions between the nodes basing on the observations of neurophysiological signals , e.g., on the multichannel EEG or MEG measurements (see Refs. [3] and recent review [4]).

Many methods developed here are based on cross-correlations and mutual information analysis, applicable to general stochastic processes [5]. However, if the data belong to a special class of processes with a known structure of the dynamical laws, much better reconstruction of connectivity can be achieved by use of special methods developed for such a particular class. For example, if the signals can be considered as those from self-sustained oscillating units, powerful methods of analysis based on the phase dynamics equations have been developed [6].

In this paper we suggest a method for network reconstruction under assumption that the observed chaotic neural fields are firing rates, interacting according to a widely accepted model for neural field dynamics (see Section II below). Each field is influenced by many others, what makes the problem of reconstruction non-trivial. On the other hand, the local dynamics is governed by a scalar differential equation, structure of which is rather simple, what makes the whole problem tractable. Below we assume only the knowledge of a general structure of the underlying dynamical equations, but not particular regularity: thus our approach generalizes that of Ref. [7], where knowledge of the functions determining the dynamics has been assumed. Our method is analogous to the approach of reconstruction of a network of time-delayed units, suggested and applied to experimental data in Ref. [8].

The paper is organized as follows. We introduce the neural network model and demonstrate its chaotic behavior in Section II. The method for reconstruction of the connectivity and its application to the network introduced in Sec. II is described in Section III. Further possible extensions are discussed in Conclusion.

II. NEURAL NETWORK MODEL AND ITS DYNAMICS

In this paper we focus on reconstruction of the network structure that governs neural fields in the firing rates formulation, one of the basic models in computational neuroscience (see Refs. [9], here we particularly follow book [10]). Each of n nodes is characterized by its time-depending firing rate $x_j(t)$, which evolves depending on inputs from other nodes according to a system of ordinary differential equations

$$\tau_j \frac{dx_j}{dt} + x_j = F_j\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} w_{jk} x_k\right), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n\,. \qquad (1)$$

Here τ_j is the time constant of relaxation of the field at node j, and F_j are gain functions at the nodes. The network is determined by the $n \times n$ coupling matrix w_{jk}. As has been shown in Ref. [11], at large enough coupling such a network demonstrates chaos, and this is a state which allows one for reconstruction of the network matrix w_{jk} from the observations $x_j(t)$, as described below.

We illustrate a chaotic state for the following set of parameters: $n = 100$; $1 - \tau^0 < \tau_j < 1 + \tau^0$ are random numbers taken from a uniform distribution with $\tau^0 = 0.1$. Functions F_j have the same form but different amplitudes: $F_j(u) = \alpha_j/[1 + \exp(-u - \rho_j)]$, where $1 - \alpha^0 < \alpha_j < 1 + \alpha^0$ are random numbers taken from a uniform distribution with $\alpha^0 = 0.1$. The links w_{ij} are non-zero with probability $p_c = 0.15$ (thus, the connections are relatively sparse), their values are taken from a normal distribution $w_{ij} = J \cdot N(0, 1)$ with $J = 8$. Finally,

$\rho_i = \eta_i - 0.5\sum_j w_{ij}$, where η_i is taken from a normal distribution $N(0,1)$. Fig. 1 shows the first 20 chaotic fields $x_j(t)$, for a realization of parameters. This chaotic state is used below for illustration of the reconstruction method.



FIG. 1. (color online) Example of chaotic neural fields (first 20 fields $x_i(t)$, for $k = 1, \ldots, 20$ are depicted with different colors).

III. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CONNECTIVITY MATRIX

A. Method of Reconstruction

Suppose one observes time series of all variables $\vec{x}(t)$ governed by Eq. (1). The problem is to reconstruct the coupling matrix w from these observations. We notice that the functions F_j and parameters τ_j are unknown and are generally different. We will see that the reconstruction method allows one to reveal these quantities as well.

The main idea is to use monotonicity of the functions F, which we do not need to know explicitly. For illustration and to simplify notations, we discuss below only reconstruction of the function F_1, of the parameter parameter τ_1, and of the coupling constants w_{1j}, all other quantities can be found similarly. We denote the row of the coupling constants as a vector $\vec{c}$, where $c_j = w_{1j}$.

Suppose first that parameter τ_1 is known. Let us select all those points from the time series, for which $\tau_1\dot{x}_1 + x_1$ lies in a small neighborhood of a given value y. Let us denote the corresponding times as $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_{m+1}$. Let us take vectors $\vec{x}(t_k)$, $k = 1, \ldots, m+1$ at these moments of time. Then, for all these vectors

$$F_1(\vec{c}\cdot\vec{x}(t_k)) \approx y\ .$$

This means, because function F_1 is one-to-one, that

$$\vec{c}\cdot\vec{x}(t_k) \approx \vec{c}\cdot\vec{x}(t_j) \quad \text{for all} \quad k, j\ . \tag{2}$$

Using the differences

$$\vec{z}(k) = \vec{x}(t_{k+1}) - \vec{x}(t_k), \quad k = 1, \ldots, m\ ,$$

we can rewrite (2) as

$$\vec{z}(k)\cdot\vec{c} = 0\ . \tag{3}$$

We need to find $\vec{c}$ from this set of equations. One can see that system (3) does not depend on the choice of y, thus we can take all possible observed values of y and obtain a large set of vectors $\vec{z}$ that all satisfy (3). The whole set of M these vectors should be used for determining the unknown coupling vector $\vec{c}$.

The formulated task is nothing else as solving homogeneous linear equations using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD), see, e.g., Ref. [12]. The problem reduces to finding the null space of a $M \times n$ matrix A, composed of M vectors $\vec{z}(k)$ as the rows. Once the zero singular value of A is found, the corresponding entry in the obtained unitary matrix gives the vector $\vec{c}$ (up to normalization, which anyhow cannot be found by this method because the function F_1 is unknown).

Above we have assumed that the parameter τ_1 is known. In a realistic situation, parameter τ_1 is unknown. Then the procedure above can be used for a set of values of τ_1, chosen from a reasonable range. For each such value the minimal singular value of matrix A can be found, and the proper τ_1 should be chosen as yielding the minimum of these singular values.

The method described above is based on the simple observation, that close values of the function F_1 mean that the arguments of this function are also close to each other. However, typically function F_1 is a sigmoidal function (in models often $\tanh(\cdot)$ is used), which have domains with derivative close to zero, where the inversion is nearly singular. Therefore, the values of $y = \tau_1\dot{x}_1 + x_1$ which are nearly constants should be excluded from the analysis. Practically, we use all the points for which $|\dot{y}| > \sigma$, with some threshold σ. After all these points have been extracted from a time series, we just sorted them. In this way the nearest neighbors after sorting are the closest points for which $y(t_1) \approx y(t_2)$, and the corresponding difference vector $\vec{z} = \vec{x}(t_1) - \vec{x}(t_2)$ is used to fill the matrix A.

B. Numerical Results

Here we present the results of the reconstruction of coupling, for the chaotic regime presented in Fig. 1. Fig. 2 illustrates the role of parameter σ that discriminates tails of function F_1 where its derivative is minimal. One can see that taking $\sigma = 0.3$ yields points in the bulk of chaotic variations.

In Fig. 3 we show the results of calculations of the minimal singular value for the process presented at Fig. 2 with $\sigma = 0.3$, in dependence on the test values of τ_1, for different total lengths of the time series. One can see that for the method to work, the length of the time series T should be large enough (in our case $T \gtrsim 250$) - otherwise the set of vectors $\vec{z}$ is too small and the distances between neighbors of the sorted array of values of y are too large.



FIG. 2. (color online) Solid red line: $y(t) = \tau_1\dot{x}_1 + x_1$ is sampled with time step 0.05, points where $|y| > 0.3$ are shown with blue squares.



FIG. 3. (color online) Dependence of the minimal singular value on the parameter τ for different lengths of time series (from top to bottom: total used time intervals $2500, 1250, 500, 250, 100$). Vertical line shows the true value of τ.

Based on the analysis presented in Fig. 3, in Fig. 4 we show the results of reconstruction of the coupling coefficients [13], for 4 lengths of the time series used, that demonstrate a pronounced minimum of the singular value. The value of τ was taken from the corresponding minima. In all cases the reconstructed coupling nearly coincides with the true one. This proves that the accuracy of the method is good, it allows one to infer the connectivity matrix from the time series.

To characterize the accuracy (which can be hardly estimated from Fig. 4 as the points practically overlap), we calculated the medians of the distributions of errors $|w_{1j} - w^r_{1j}|$, where w_{1j} are coupling constants used in the simulations (they are shown with circles in Fig. 4), and w^r_{1j} are reconstructed values. One can see from Fig. 5 that as expected, the accuracy is improved if a longer time series is available.

Finally, we show in Fig. 6, how the function F_1 is reconstructed after the coupling constants are found.



FIG. 4. (color online) Original coupling constants w_{1j} (circles) and the reconstructed ones w^r_{1j} for the data sets with total used time intervals $T = 2500, 1250, 500, 250$ (the corresponding markers). In these sets the number of data points used for reconstruction was $8961, 4174, 1627, 796$, respectively.



FIG. 5. Median errors for the reconstruction depicted in Fig. 4, as functions of the total time interval used.



FIG. 6. Reconstruction of the gain function F_1. The same data points as in finding the coupling matrix Fig. 4, with $T = 2500$, are used.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have developed a method to reconstruct the connection network behind a collection of interacting neural fields, provided the observations of the

firing rates on the nodes are available. The method delivers the connectivity matrix, together with the parameters characterizing node's dynamics, such as the time constant and the gain function at each node. We have demonstrated that for a reliable reconstruction a sufficient length of the time series is needed. In this first study we assumed a rather ideal situation where data for all nodes are available and not contaminated by noise; exploration of the restrictions imposed by these effects is a subject of an ongoing research.

We have formulated the method for the neural field model based on firing rates. There is an equivalent voltage formulation of the model where, in fact, other variables are used [10]. The approach described is not directly suited for these variables; its corresponding generalization remains a challenging task.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge useful discussions with V. Ponomarenko, Z. Levnajic, A. Daffertshofer, and M. Rosenblum. The work was supported by ITN COSMOS (funded by the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 642563) and by the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 14-12-00811).

[1] J. I. Deza, M. Barreiro, and C. Masoller, Chaos **25**, 033105 (2015); G. Sugihara, R. May, H. Ye, C.-h. Hsieh, E. Deyle, M. Fogarty, and S. Munch, Science **338**, 496500 (2012); I. Tomovski and L. Kocarev, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **436**, 272 (2015); Z. Li, P. Li, A. Krishnan, and J. Liu, Bioinformatics **27**, 2686 (2011).

[2] M. Boly, M. Massimini, M. Garrido, O. Gosseries, Q. Noirhomme, S. Laureys, and A. Soddu, Brain Connectivity **2**, 1 (2012); E. Pastrana, Nature Methods **10**, 481 (2013); O. Sporns, *ibid.* **10**, 491 (2013).

[3] D. Smirnov, B. Schelter, M. Winterhalder, and J. Timmer, Chaos **17**, 013111 (2007); P. Skudlarski, K. Jagannathan, V. D. Calhoun, M. Hampson, B. A. Skudlarska, and G. Pearlson, NeuroImag **43**, 554561 (2008); D. Chicharro, R. Andrzejak, and A. Ledberg, BMC Neurosci. **12**, P192 (2011); D. Yu and U. Parlitz, PloS One **6**, e24333 (2011).

[4] K. Lehnertz, Physiol. Meas. **32**, 1715 (2011).

[5] B. Schelter, J. Timmer, and M. Eichler, J. Neurosci. Methods **179**, 121 (2009); R. G. Andrzejak and T. Kreuz, EPL **96**, 50012 (2011); N. Rubido, A. C. Martí, E. Bianco-Martínez, C. Grebogi, M. S. Baptista, and C. Masoller, New Journal of Physics **16**, 093010 (2014); G. Tirabassi, R. Sevilla-Escoboza, J. M. Buldú, and C. Masoller, Sci. Reports **5**, 10829 (2015).

[6] B. Kralemann, A. Pikovsky, and M. Rosenblum, Chaos **21**, 025104 (2011); New Journal of Physics **16**, 085013 (2014).

[7] Z. Levnajić and A. Pikovsky, Sci. Rep. **4**, 5030 (2014).

[8] I. V. Sysoev, M. D. Prokhorov, V. I. Ponomarenko, and B. P. Bezruchko, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 062911 (2014).

[9] F. C. Hoppensteadt and E. M. Izhikevich, *Weakly Connected Neural Networks* (Springer, Berlin, 1997); P. C. Bressloff, J. Phys. A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45**, 033001 (2012).

[10] G. B. Ermentrout and D. H. Terman, *Mathematical foundations of neuroscience*, Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics, Vol. 35 (Springer, New York, 2010) pp. xvi+422.

[11] H. Sompolinsky, A. Crisanti, and H. J. Sommers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 259 (1988).

[12] L. N. Trefethen and D. Bau, III, *Numerical linear algebra* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1997) pp. xii+361.

[13] Although only relative values of the coupling constants can be reconstructed, here for clarity of comparison we normalized them by the norm of true coupling vector $|\vec{c}|$.